

THE LAW OFFICES OF
ANDREW D. FORTNEY, PH.D., P.C.
7257 N. MAPLE AVENUE, SUITE 107
FRESNO, CALIFORNIA 93720

WWW.FORTNEYLAW.COM

TELEPHONE: (559) 299-0128

FAX: (559) 299-0118

EMAIL: INFO@FORTNEYLAW.COM

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

APR 18 2006

ANDREW D. FORTNEY, PH.D.

ALEC B. PLUMB*

*REGISTERED PATENT AGENT

ATTN: MAIL STOP APPEAL BRIEF-PATENTS

COMPANY: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS / P.O. BOX 1450, ALEXANDRIA VA 22313-1450

FAX: 1 (571) 273-8300

DATE: 04-18-2006

TIME: 3:10 PM

- ☐ WITH CONFIRMATION
☒ WITHOUT CONFIRMATION

RE: APPLICATION NO. 09/312,797
FILED: 05-17-1999

I hereby certify that this document and all documents listed below are being transmitted via facsimile to
Commissioner for Patents, fax no. (571) 273-8300, on April 18, 2006.

By: Jennie Heaton

Jennie Heaton

SUBMITTED HERewith FOR THE ABOVE-CAPTIONED APPLICATION:

- Transmittal Form
- Reply Brief Under 37 C.F.R. § 41.41 (5 Pgs.)

Respectfully submitted,

Alec B. Plumb
Alec B. Plumb; Reg. No. 56,433

PLEASE DIRECT ANY QUESTIONS REGARDING THE TRANSMISSION OF THIS FAX TO:
(559) 299-0128 / FAX (559) 299-0118 / INFO@FORTNEYLAW.COM

THIS FAX CONTAINS 8 PAGE(S) INCLUDING THIS ONE.

This message is intended for its recipient(s) only, and may contain attorney-client privileged communications, attorney work product or other privileged communications. No waiver of any applicable legal privilege is intended by this transmission. If this transmission is received in error by other than the intended recipient(s), please notify the Law Offices of Andrew Fortney at the phone/fax number listed at the top of this page and then please return or destroy the transmitted document. Thank you for your cooperation and assistance.

PTO/SB/21 (08-04)

Approved for use through 07/31/2008, OMB 0851-0031
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number.

TRANSMITTAL FORM (to be used for all correspondence after initial filing)	Application Number	09/312,797	RECEIVED CENTRAL FAX CENTER APR 18 2006
	Filing Date	05-17-1999	
	First Named Inventor	Shipeng Li	
	An Unit	2613	
	Examiner Name	Lee, Y. Young	
Total Number of Pages in This Submission	8	Attorney Docket Number	MTKI-04-355A

ENCLOSURES (Check all that apply)		
<input type="checkbox"/> Fee Transmittal Form <input type="checkbox"/> Fee Attached <input type="checkbox"/> Amendment/Reply <input type="checkbox"/> After Final <input type="checkbox"/> Affidavits/declaration(s) <input type="checkbox"/> Extension of Time Request <input type="checkbox"/> Express Abandonment Request <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement <input type="checkbox"/> Certified Copy of Priority Document(s) <input type="checkbox"/> Reply to Missing Parts/Incomplete Application <input type="checkbox"/> Reply to Missing Parts under 37 CFR 1.52 or 1.53	<input type="checkbox"/> Drawing(s) <input type="checkbox"/> Licensing-related Papers <input type="checkbox"/> Petition <input type="checkbox"/> Petition to Convert to a Provisional Application <input type="checkbox"/> Power of Attorney, Revocation <input type="checkbox"/> Change of Correspondence Address <input type="checkbox"/> Terminal Disclaimer <input type="checkbox"/> Request for Refund <input type="checkbox"/> CD, Number of CD(s) _____ <input type="checkbox"/> Landscape Table on CD	<input type="checkbox"/> After Allowance Communication to TC <input type="checkbox"/> Appeal Communication to Board of Appeals and Interferences <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Appeal Communication to TC (Appeal Notice, Brief, Reply Brief) <input type="checkbox"/> Proprietary Information <input type="checkbox"/> Status Letter <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other Enclosure(s) (please identify below): • Fax Transmission Cover Page
Remarks		

SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT, ATTORNEY, OR AGENT			
Firm Name	The Law Offices of Andrew D. Fortney, Ph.D., P.C.		
Signature	<i>Alec B. Plumb</i>		
Printed name	Alec B. Plumb		
Date	04-18-2006	Reg. No.	56,433

CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION/MAILING			
I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the USPTO or deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on the date shown below:			
Signature	<i>Jennie Heaton</i>		
Typed or printed name	Jennie Heaton	Date	04-18-2006

This collection of information is required by 37 CFR 1.6. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.11 and 1.14. This collection is estimated to 2 hours to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

If you need assistance in completing the form, call 1-800-PTO-9199 and select option 2.

Attorney Docket No. MTKI-04-355A

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT & TRADEMARK OFFICE
BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES**

IN RE APPLICATION OF:

Shipeng Li

SERIAL NO: 09/312,797

CONFIRMATION NO.: 3062

FILED: May 17, 1999

**FOR: METHOD AND APPARATUS
FOR GENERIC SCALABLE
SHAPE CODING**

MAIL STOP APPEAL BRIEF-PATENTS
COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. BOX 1450
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313-1450

FAX: (571) 273-8300

மா மா மா மா மா மா மா மா மா மா மா மா மா மா மா மா மா மா மா மா

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

APR 18 2006

GROUP ART UNIT: 2613

EXAMINER: Y. Young Lee

I hereby certify that this document is being facsimile transmitted to the USPTO or deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on April 18, 2006.

By:

Jennie Heaton

REPLY BRIEF UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 41.41

SIR:

Appellants hereby Reply to the Examiner's Answer mailed on February 21, 2006. This Reply is intended to supplement the Appeal Brief as originally filed on February 3, 2003, and as amended on July 30, 2004. The arguments presented in the prior Appeal Briefs are still relied upon.

Attorney Docket No. MTKI-04-355A
Serial No: 09/312,797

ARGUMENT

The rejection of Claims 1, 2, and 27-30 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Lee et al (U.S. Patent No. 5,748,749, "Lee") remains respectfully traversed. The Examiner's Answer repeats the mischaracterization of Lee with respect to the present invention.

The present invention relates to a method for coding an input object mask, where the input object mask has a plurality of regions. The method (as recited in independent Claim 1) includes the steps of (a) assigning at least one symbol to each of the plurality of regions, (b) coding the assigned symbols of the input object mask, (c) decomposing the input object mask into a plurality of object mask layers of different spatial resolution, (d) coding a base object layer of the plurality of object mask layers, and (e) coding a next higher layer of the plurality of object mask layers in accordance with information from a lower object mask layer.

Because the present invention relates to a method for coding an input object mask, it is important to understand what an object mask is. As taught in the specification of the present application, an object mask indicates the arbitrary shape of an image or video object and the region in which the texture of this object needs to be coded. The object mask contains shape information having one of two possible values for each pixel: transparent or opaque (where transparent means the corresponding pixel is outside of an object and opaque means the corresponding pixel is within the object). Thus, an object mask includes binary shape information.

In one example of an object mask, FIG. 1(a) of the present application shows such an arbitrary shaped object 100 and FIG. 1(b) shows the corresponding binary object mask 110 that

Attorney Docket No. MTKI-04-355A
Serial No: 09/312,797

identifies the shape and texture region of the object. Although the arbitrary shaped object 100 contains specific texture information, illustrated by the different grayscale shading, such specific texture information is not captured by the object mask. The exemplary object mask contains only the shape information and whether a pixel is within an object. (See specification, page 2, lines 1-13.)

The object mask is not, therefore, a representation of a full frame. The present invention relates to a method that decomposes the input *object mask* into a plurality of *object mask* layers of different spatial resolution. In contrast, Lee fails to teach or suggest any steps relating to decomposition of an object mask. Therefore, Lee fails to disclose all of the limitations of independent Claim 1.

The Examiner's Answer repeats the assertion that FIG. 16 of Lee shows "where the input object mask has a plurality of regions." However, FIG. 16 does not have any relation to an object mask. Lee teaches that FIG. 16 is "a simplified fragmentary representation of a *display screen* showing the *image frame* of FIG. 7B" (see, e.g., Lee, col. 4, lines 57-58). Lee further discloses that FIG. 16 includes "object 204b." However, Lee does not teach, suggest, or imply, that FIG. 16 shows an object mask (e.g., shape information indicating whether a pixel is part of an object). Therefore, the Examiner is incorrect in the assertion that FIG. 16 of Lee discloses an input object mask where the input object mask has a plurality of regions, because FIG. 16 fails to show an object mask at all.

The Examiner's Answer also repeats the assertion that FIG. 35 of Lee shows assigning at least one symbol to each of the plurality of regions. FIG. 35 does not show an object mask (and therefore does not show the plurality of regions in an object mask, as recited by Claim 1 of the

Attorney Docket No. MTKI-04-355A
Serial No: 09/312,797

present application). Lee teaches that FIG. 35 "illustrates how a frame of video can be divided into the objects in the frame" (see, e.g., Lee, col. 5, lines 54-55). FIG. 35 therefore does not disclose assigning at least one symbol to each of the plurality of regions in an object mask.

The Examiner's Answer further repeats the assertion that FIG. 38 of Lee shows coding the assigned symbols of the input object mask contextually in accordance with neighboring regions. FIG. 38 does show "an object-based video coding method." However, FIG. 38 only shows a shape coding block 1632 passing shape information to a multiplexer 1644. FIG. 38 does not show — and nowhere does Lee disclose or suggest — coding an input object mask contextually in accordance with neighboring regions.

The Examiner's Answer also repeats the assertion that FIGS. 16 and 35 of Lee show decomposing the input object mask into a plurality of object mask layers of different spatial resolution. As shown above, FIG. 16 shows an image frame rather than an object mask. Furthermore, FIG. 35 does not show — and nowhere does Lee disclose or suggest — decomposing an object mask into a plurality of object mask layers of different spatial resolution.

The Examiner's Answer introduces the article "Wavelets for a Vision" by Stéphane Mallat ("Mallat") to illustrate the wavelet coding technique. However, Mallat relates to multiresolution decomposition of images (see, e.g., FIGS. 1 and 2). A full text search of Mallat reveals that Mallat does not discuss object masks and does not disclose any operations on masks of any type. Therefore, none of the art referenced by the Examiner, alone or in combination with Lee, teaches or suggests decomposing an object mask (rather than an image frame) into a plurality of object mask layers.

Attorney Docket No. MTKI-04-355A
Serial No: 09/312,797

Thus, the Examiner's Answer fails to substantiate the Examiner's assertions that Lee discloses or suggests all of the limitations of independent Claim 1 of the present application. Therefore, the rejection of independent Claim 1 and dependent Claim 2 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Lee is improper, and should be withdrawn.

Independent claims 27 and 29 contain substantially similar limitations to independent Claim 1. Therefore, for the same reasons given with respect to independent Claim 1, above, the rejection of independent Claims 27 and 29, and of dependent Claims 28 and 30 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Lee is improper, and should be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

Thus, the Appellants submits that all of the claims presently in the application are patentable over Lee under the provisions of 35 U.S.C. § 102(e). Consequently, Appellants believe all these Claims are presently in condition for allowance.

For the reasons advanced above, Appellants respectfully urge that the rejection of Claims 1, 2, and 27-30 as being anticipated under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) is improper. Reversal of the rejections of the Office Action is respectfully requested.

Attorney Docket No. MTKI-04-355A
Serial No: 09/312,797

Respectfully submitted,



Andrew D. Fortney, Ph.D.
Reg. No. 34,600

Alec B. Plumb
Reg. No. 56,433

THE LAW OFFICES OF ANDREW D. FORTNEY, PH.D., P.C.

7257 N. Maple Avenue, Suite 107
Fresno, California 93720
(559) 299 - 0128

ABP:abp